



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,191	01/09/2001	Mitsuo Inoue	201841US2	5684

22850 7590 06/23/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SELBY, GEVELL V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/756,191	Applicant(s) INOUE ET AL.	
	Examiner Gevell Selby	Art Unit 2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/18/05 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see the amendment, filed 2/18/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and claim(s) 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, and Erbey, US 6,476,850.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2615

2. Claims 1-3, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850.

In regard to claim 1, Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, discloses an imaging apparatus comprising:

an imaging device (see figure 1) having a plurality of photoelectric transfer devices arranged in a matrix shape to detect a light irradiated to each photoelectric transfer device and transfer the light into an electric signal (see column 2, lines 32-35: it is inherent that the CCD (6) has a plurality of photoelectric transfer devices arranged in matrix-shape, in order to capture the two-dimensional images.);

imaging means for imaging an image of a photogenic object (see figure 1, element 6) on a surface of the imaging device, the imaging means imaging at least two images (see figure 1) of the photogenic subject onto different areas of the surface of the imaging device (see column 2, lines 44-51).

The Hankawa reference does not disclose an electric signal processing means for interleaving the at least two images of the photogenic object into one integrated image of the photogenic object.

Erbey, US 6,476,850, discloses an imaging apparatus comprising an electric signal processing means (see figure 6, element 20a) for electrically synthesizing the at least two images of the photogenic object into one integrated image of the photogenic object (see column 4, lines 33-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of

Erbey, US 6,476,850, to have an electric signal processing means for interleaving the at least two images of the photogenic object into one integrated image of the photogenic object in order to produce a high quality stereographic image from the two images that can be displayed without the use of display glasses.

In regard to claim 2, Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, discloses all the limitations of claim 1. The Hankawa reference discloses that the imaging means is composed of a plurality of lens systems (see figure 1, elements 4 a & b) having the same shape or refractive index and arranged in a plane parallel to a light receiving surface of the imaging device (see figure 1 and column 2, lines 26-34).

In regard to claim 3, Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, discloses all the limitations of claim 2. The Hankawa reference discloses that the image formation lenses composing each lens system are formed integrally (see Figure 1, elements 4a & b: each system of lenses (4a and b) is shown to be formed integrally or together as one unit).

In regard to claim 6, Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, discloses all the limitations of claim 1. The Hankawa reference discloses that the imaging means includes a plurality of lens systems (see figure 1, elements 4 a & b and column 2, lines 26-34), and an optical center of each of the plurality of lens systems is aligned axially with a center of a corresponding one of the plurality of photoelectric devices (see figure 1, paths a and b: The lens are aligned with the image sensor so that the centers of the optical paths (a and b) align with the center pixel of the CCD).

In regard to claim 8, Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, discloses all the limitations of claim 1. The Hankawa reference discloses wherein the electrical signal processing means interleaves pixels of corresponding position of the at least two images (see column 4, lines 34-55).

3. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nelson, US 5,237,340, in further view of Booth US 5,738,427.

In regard to claims 4 and 5, Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, discloses all the previous limitations in claim 2. The Hankawa and Erbey references do not disclose that a plurality of image formation lenses composing each lens system are formed integrally of material or bonded on a substrate having a linear expansion coefficient of not more than $1 \times 10^{-5}/^{\circ}\text{C}$. However, it is well known in the art that a high linear expansion coefficient in a lens will cause deformation of the lens, resulting in an unclear image. Pyrex lenses have a low linear expansion coefficient and thus can solve this problem as Nelson and Booth teach in the following:

Nelson teaches an integrally formed lens portion made of Pyrex glass (Column 5, Lines 60-69). Booth further teaches that Pyrex glass has a low linear expansion coefficient of not more than $1 \times 10^{-5}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ (Column 5 Lines 55-63).

The use of a low coefficient of linear expansion will allow for the rigid mounting of a lens and also the high change in temperature will not cause deformation of the lens and thus cause it to be out of focus.

By making the lenses (4a & b) of Hankawa Pyrex lenses as taught in Nelson, the image formation lenses composing the lens system would be formed of a material having a linear expansion of not more than $1 \times 10^{-5}/^{\circ}\text{C}$.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to modify Hankawa et al., US 5,727,239, in view of Erbey, US 6,476,850, further in view of Nelson, US 5,237,340, and Booth US 5,738,427 to have a plurality of image formation lenses composing each lens system formed integrally of material or bonded on a substrate having a linear expansion coefficient of not more than $1 \times 10^{-5}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ in order to be able to rigidly mount the lens and not have deformation of the lens resulting in an out of focus unclear image.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7 and 9 are allowed.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art does not disclose the combination of limitations claimed, specifically the limitation of:

“an electric signal processor configured to interleave at least three images of the subject to form an integrated image of the subject” as claimed in claim 7.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2615

US 5,835,133, discloses a stereo video camera wherein the two images are captured on one image sensor.


US 6,750,904, discloses a camera system that is hardwired to interleaves multiple images into an image memory.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gevell Selby whose telephone number is 571-272-7369. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 PM (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gvs



DAVID L. OMETZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER